

---

# 6

## Action Item

### *Educational Policy and Programs Committee*

Approval of the Minutes of the October 16, 2000, Meeting

---



---

---

# MINUTES

## *Educational Policy and Programs Committee*

Meeting of October 16, 2000

---

**Committee  
members present**

Carol Chandler, *Chair*  
Robert Hanff  
Lance Izumi  
Kyo "Paul" Jhin  
Velma Montoya  
Roger Schrimp  
Howard Welinsky  
Guillermo Rodriguez, *ex officio*  
Alan S. Arkatov, *ex officio*

**Other Commissioners present**

Ralph Pesqueira  
Evonne Schulze  
Kyhl Smeby  
Melinda G. Wilson

**Committee  
member absent**

Monica Lozano, *Vice Chair*

---

**Call to order**

Committee Chair Chandler called the October 16, 2000 meeting of the Educational Policy and Programs Committee to order at 9:40 a.m. in Room 202 of the Sacramento Convention Center, 1400 J Street, Sacramento, California.

---

**Approval  
of the minutes**

Chair Chandler asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the committee's August 21, 2000 meeting. It was so moved and the committee voted without dissent to approve the minutes as submitted.

---

**The California  
State University,  
Channel Islands**

Chair Chandler called upon staff member Beth Graybill to present this item. Ms. Graybill said the California State University (CSU) had proposed to establish its 23rd campus in Ventura County to be called CSU Channel Islands. She said the Commission had reviewed the proposal and acknowledged the work of other Commission staff and CSU personnel in completing this analysis and the resulting information item. She introduced Handel Evens, President of the Channel Islands campus, and Vice Provost Barbara Thorpe.

Ms. Graybill reviewed the proposal for a full-service CSU campus to open in 2002 with 1,320 full-time equivalent students on the site of the former Camarillo State Hospital. The CSU Northridge Ventura Center, which has 1,800 headcount students currently, now operates at that site and will continue in tandem with the campus until the center is

phased out, around 2005-06. She said the new campus would fulfill a long-standing desire for a CSU campus to serve the region. Among the benefits of the facility, she said that the new campus would improve statewide higher education access, increase local CSU participation rates, respond to growing regional population growth, and improve overall degree-completion rates in the region. She reviewed the campus costs and the proposed academic plan for the new campus. She said that the evidence supports a finding that the CSU Channel Islands campus would develop in accordance with state-wide needs and priorities, serve the higher education needs of the community and its students, and develop an academic plan that is responsive to local educational and labor-market needs. There is also widespread local support from educational institutions, government and the general community. She said staff was prepared to find that CSU had met the review criteria established by the Commission and was recommending its authorization.

Ms. Graybill said staff also recommend that CSU provide a timetable for accreditation of the Channel Islands campus by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), a copy of the approved CSU Northridge Ventura Center and CSU Camarillo transition plan, a copy of the fully developed academic plan, and an update report in 2001 on development of the east campus area.

Commissioner Pesqueira cited the staff for good work on the Commission report and said CSU would comply with the requests of the Commission for additional information.

Commissioner Smeby said he appreciated the comment that there would be continuing collaboration between CSU and the independent institutions in the region.

President Evans said this was a long-term collaboration that would continue. He said the campus is unique and invited the commissioners to visit the site.

There was a general discussion about various aspects of developing and planning for the new CSU site. Among the items discussed were the unique nature of retrofitting an existing facility, cooperative steps in academic planning that has included community colleges, measures taken to attract facility with on-site housing, outreach efforts to recruit local students, financing of campus development, and the process of obtaining the necessary local, state, and federal permits. It was noted that CSU had benefited from the experience of establishing other campuses such as Monterey Bay and San Marcos.

Director Fox introduced other CSU officials present. They were Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer Dave Spence, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Gary Hammers, and Jim Highsmith, a faculty member at CSU Fresno who chaired the task force on academic planning.

Chair Rodriguez asked about college-going rates in the region, the projection that 90 percent of the Channel Island enrollment is to come from Ventura County, and the impact the proposed campus will have on Tidal Wave II statewide enrollment demand. He asked if the new campus would be pulling new students into higher education or just redirecting students who are or already plan to be enrolled. He said he would like to see more new first-time freshmen introduced to the system. There was a general discussion about the change new facilities might foster in local college-going rates. It was pointed

out that the enrollment projections for the campus were consistent with Commission methodology and had been approved by the Department of Finance.

Vice Chair Arkatov asked about the timeline for completing an agreement with CSU Northridge and the academic master plan. President Evans said the agreement is near completion and that the academic plan discussion will start in January 2001. Vice Chair Arkatov suggested the Commission convene a special teleconference meeting to address final approval of the proposal.

Commission Jhin agreed with the suggestion for an expedited Commission approval and asked for more details about academic planning for the campus. A wide-ranging discussion followed about academic planning to meet the changing economic needs of the region, including a shift from local agriculture, to international agri-business and new technology. There was also a discussion about the capital outlay plans for the facility. Staff expressed confidence in the near-term capital outlay estimates and said the long-range plans had less certainty.

---

**Part-time faculty  
compensation in  
California  
Community  
Colleges**

Committee Chair Chandler called upon staff member Kathleen Chavira to brief the Commission about efforts underway to comply with AB 420.

Ms. Chavira said MGT of America was selected to work with staff on completion of the study called for in this legislation. She introduced Janelle Kubinec, the MGT project coordinator.

Ms. Chavira reviewed the firm's history and experience. She discussed the project timeline, noting that a survey associated with the study had been distributed and that a preliminary report would be presented to the Commission in February 2001, with a report for action in April 2001.

There was a general discussion about part-time employment and compensation in the community colleges, and about the potential financial, collective bargaining, and political issues that surround the topic. Ms. Chavira said the study would include historical information about this issue.

Christopher Cabaldon, California Community College representative, said the Chancellor's office is pleased with the aggressive scheduling of the Commission study. He said many parties are awaiting the results of the Commission's study. He said that the Chancellor's Office believes it would cost from \$300 to \$500 million dollars to resolve the entire part-time faculty pay disparity issue, but that the community college system had sought more surgical and fundable solutions aimed first at what they believe to be the highest-priority problems. He said the community college Board of Governors is considering both legislative and budget initiatives to address the issues associated with part-time employment issues. He stated that the community colleges are willing to cooperate in the study.

There was a general discussion about the focus, schedule, methodology, and advisory committee composition for the study. It was established that the study is on schedule and that the advisory committee includes many faculty representatives. There was a

conversation about differences among part-time community college staff, including those who teach a full-time load of courses by shuttling from district to district – the so-called “freeway flyers.”

In response to possible legislative initiatives that might be sought, Mr. Cabaldon stated that, based upon their data, they estimate that 5 to 10 percent of all part-time community college faculties are freeway flyers teaching full academic loads. He said the issue of compensation for this group is easier to resolve than that of employment security.

Vice Chair Arkatov asked about a response to the recent report by the State Auditor General on the calculation of instructional activity in community colleges.

Mr. Cabaldon said the Auditor’s report was correct about enforcement of the 50-percent law and that the Chancellor’s is committed to rectifying that. He said another important issue revolves around defining the duties of faculty that appropriately counted as part of instruction. He said the Commission study would address this issue.

There was a discussion about making meaningful comparisons across states of part-time faculty issues.

Mr. Cabaldon said Washington state had looked closely at part-time faculty issues there. He said the Chancellor’s office has no major problem with the study’s methodology and he does not believe faculty groups will either.

Committee Chair Chandler thanked staff and others for the report and discussion and said this is an important topic.

---

**Student profiles,  
2000**

Committee Chair Chandler called upon staff member ZoAnn Laurente to present the Student Profiles 2000 study.

Ms. Laurente said the Student Profiles report compiles much commonly sought student data under one cover and that it frequently served as a foundation for intersegmental discussions about California students. She reviewed the report organization, including changes from prior editions, and provided some highlights of the new report, including the following:

- ◆ The annual total of high school graduates is nearly 300,000, with some 100,000 completing the A through G sequence of college preparatory course requirements;
- ◆ While racial diversity has increased in all sectors of higher education, there has been a marked decline in the proportion of whites and a decrease in the overall number of males;
- ◆ The total number of first-time freshmen has increased;
- ◆ Community college transfers are up for the fall term at CSU and UC, and up for CSU for the full year, with a steady decrease in lower-division transfer and an increase in upper division transfers; and
- ◆ Community college transfer students now represent nearly 31 percent of all students earning a BA degree at UC and over 60 percent at CSU.

Chair Rodriguez stated it is important for this report to be widely disseminated to many different audiences. Vice Chair Arkatov agreed. Ms. Laurente described some of the groups to whom the report is sent. Commissioner Arkatov suggested that the most important aspects the report be identified and flagged. Director Fox said information “gems” will be mined from the data and highlighted throughout the year.

---

**Recess** Committee Chair Chandler recessed the committee meeting at 11:50 for lunch.

---

**Reconvene** The Committee reconvened at 1:10 p.m.

---

**The production and utilization of educational doctorates in California**

Committee Chair Chandler called upon staff member Marge Chisholm to present this item.

Ms. Chisholm introduced consultant Bill Furry and Judith Cantrell Harris who have worked on the project. Ms. Chisholm reviewed the study which is called for by AB 1279 (Scott). She described the study scope, the survey conducted, and findings.

Ms. Chisholm said the fundamental policy question is whether the State should adopt policies to foster the production of more doctorates. Based on the study’s findings, she said staff had concluded that the production of education doctorates at current levels by institutions of higher education would be sufficient to meet to meet both current demand and that in the foreseeable future. She said several significant, related issued had emerged:

- ◆ There is a low proportion of ethnic minorities who are receiving doctorates;
- ◆ There is a low proportion of males receiving doctorates; and
- ◆ There may be a need for more specialized doctorate programs.

Ms. Chisholm outlined other issues for consideration such as the content of the degree, the needs of the community college doctoral candidates, the low incidence of doctoral resources in small school districts, the link between leadership training and student outcomes.

There was a general discussion about supply and demand of doctorates, questions about the value added — for individuals and for the educational process – associated with doctorate degrees, the lack of salary and other incentives for persons in administrative positions to possess doctorate degrees, and comparisons with other states.

Committee Chair Chandler thanked all participants and said the item would be discussed again at the October Commission meeting.

Commissioner Pesqueira stated that the Commission should continue to examine the issues associated with the study and find reason to recommend that California institutions continue to offer and increase the number of doctorate degrees in the state. He expressed disappointment in the report and the focus of the survey. He said many who have earned a doctorate likely found it to be of personal value. There are issues such as availability and affordability of doctorate programs that need to be addressed. He said

the current cost of a legitimate doctorate program is from \$30,000 to \$60,000. He said there are geographic obstacles too. He said there might have been a devaluing of the doctorate in the mind of the general public. He said, while the report provides an accurate picture of the present, it does not take into account future factors that could stimulate demand for doctorate degrees.

In response to a question about which education sector is the focus of the study's supply and demand assessment, Mr. Furry clarified that it was administrators in the K-12 system. He said the assessment of the community college sector was a separate factor.

Commissioner Schulze suggested expunging the community college data from the report. Director Fox said some members of the advisory committee suggested and urged the inclusion of community colleges data.

Committee Chair Chandler asked whether joint doctorate programs addressed the affordability.

Julius Zelmanowitz, UC Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives, outlined an initiative between UC Riverside and eight CSU campuses to develop a regional joint doctorate program that has a projected capacity of some 90 education doctorates per year. He said it would appropriately train education leaders for the future. He said UC Berkeley had partnered with three CSU campuses to create a joint doctorate program on urban education leadership. Graduates of the Governor's Principal Institutes may be candidates for such joint doctorate programs he said. There have also been discussions between UC Santa Cruz and CSU San Jose, and between CSU Sacramento and UC Davis. He said he would provide a list for the commissioners.

Commissioner Montoya asked if the Commission could receive an update on the course content of the Governor's Principal Institutes.

Vice Chair Arkatov asked a number of questions about both the methodology of the report and its content. He said the report does not address certain issues, such as cost, associated with the supply side of the equation. He also said there should be an assessment of the value added of education doctorate programs. Commissioner Montoya said the central question is about the content of such programs.

Director Fox thanked all that had worked on the report. He said the final version would be in two parts, with a smaller summary portion and a larger report containing the supporting data. He summarized some of the clarifying edits and changes in the final report, including adding the issue of assessing the policy issues associated with the supply side of the equation.

---

**Academic program  
review**

Committee Chair Chandler called upon staff member Joan Sallee to present the Academic Program Review item.

Ms. Sallee reviewed the Commission's role in academic program planning, review, and evaluation. She said this report provides only a brief overview and marks a return to regular updates by staff to the Commission about activities in this area.

Ms. Sallee discussed the importance of the Commission's work in this area, outlined the Commission's legislative authority, described the process of review and authority, described the process of review, and noted the criteria used by the Commission staff in reviewing new programs proposed by the community colleges, the State University, and University of California.

A brief discussion followed about the process used by the systems to review existing programs.

---

**Adjournment** Having no further business, Chair Chandler adjourned the committee meeting at 2:33 p.m.

---